

COPY

REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge receipt of the Examiner's Office Action dated November 13, 2006. This Office Action rejected all claims pending at that time. Specifically, Claims 1 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,699,361 issued to Ding et al. (Ding). Claims 41 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Ding in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,983,019 issued to Davidson (Davidson). The remaining claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Ding in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,946,399 issued to Kitaj (Kitaj). In light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of all pending claims.

Each of the independent claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Ding or under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Ding in view of Kitaj. Each of the independent claims has been amended. For example, independent Claim 5 has been amended to indicate that the "first channel driver is coupled to a first communication channel configured to transmit a fax," and "the second channel driver is coupled to a second communication channel configured to transmit an email." Applicants assert the limitations of amended independent Claim 5 are not taught or fairly suggested in the cited sections of Ding and Kitaj, either alone or in combination with the remaining limitations of independent Claim 5. Indeed, a word search for the terms "fax" and "email" within Ding and Kitaj indicates that these two terms are not contained therein. Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent Claim 5 is patentably distinguishable over the cited sections of Ding and Kitaj.

COPY

COPY

PATENT

The remaining independent claims have been amended to recite the limitations similar to those argued above. For the same reasons set forth with respect to independent Claim 5, Applicants assert that the remaining independent claims are likewise patentably distinguishable over the cited sections of Ding and Kitaj. Given that the independent claims are patentably distinguishable, it follows that the dependable claims are likewise patentably distinguishable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5093.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia, 22313-1450, on February 13, 2007.




Attorney for Applicant

2/13/07

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Eric A. Stephenson

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 38,321

Telephone: (512) 439-5093

Facsimile: (512) 439-5099

COPY